

North Shore Gas - South Plant

Meeting

Taken on: May 20, 2015

JENSEN LITIGATION SOLUTIONS

180 North LaSalle Street

Suite 2800

Chicago, IL 60601

312.236.6936

877.653.6736

www.jensenlitigation.com



PUBLIC MEETING
U.S. EPA PROPOSED CLEANUP PLAN
FOR TAR POLLUTION
NORTH SHORE GAS SOUTH PLANT

LILAC COTTAGE, BOWEN PARK
1911 N. SHERIDAN ROAD
WAUKEGAN, ILLINOIS

MAY 20, 2015

6:00 P.M.

Reported by:

Carrie McCann, CSR

1 APPEARANCES:
2 Mr. Heriberto León
3 Mr. Ross Del Rosario
4 Mr. David Klatt
5 Mr. Marcus Byker
6 Mr. Paul Lake
7 Mr. Naren Prasad
8 Mr. Peter Felitti

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1
2 MR. LEÓN: Good evening and
3 welcome. My name is Heriberto León. I am
4 the community involvement coordinator for
5 the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,
6 Region 5 based in Chicago. We are here
7 tonight to present the U.S. EPA's proposed
8 interim cleanup plan for one of Waukegan's
9 former manufactured gas plant, the North
10 Shore Gas South Plant.

11 With me tonight is Ross
12 Del Rosario who is the U.S. EPA's remedial
13 project manager for the site. He will
14 first make a brief presentation about the
15 site and the proposed cleanup. After his
16 presentation we will do a question and
17 answer session. Then we will open it up
18 for comments.

19 We have a court reporter. So
20 please, before you present your oral
21 comments, do state your name and spell it
22 so we record it accurately along with your
23 comments.

24 All the comments that the U.S.

1 EPA receives orally tonight as well as
2 other comments coming via U.S. Mail and
3 electronically through our website will be
4 entered and addressed in our responsiveness
5 summary that will be issued and available
6 later this summer. The comment period
7 started May 6 and runs through June 5.

8 Please note our web page on the
9 back sheet. We have additional copies of
10 it on the table here in the front. You can
11 use that web page for entering your
12 comments through June 5.

13 So let's go ahead and turn it
14 over to Ross Del Rosario to make his
15 presentation. Ross?

16 MR. DEL ROSARIO: Thank you,
17 Heriberto. Good evening, ladies and
18 gentlemen.

19 Again, my is Ross Del Rosario.
20 I am the EPA project manager assigned to
21 oversee the ongoing work at the North Shore
22 Gas Former South Plant manufactured gas
23 plant site here in Waukegan, Illinois.

24 The purpose of my presentation,

1 my very brief presentation is essentially
2 to describe EPA's preferred approach to
3 deal with a major source of contamination
4 at the site, to address what we call DNAPL,
5 which is dense non-aqueous phase liquids at
6 the former South Plant site.

7 I have some slides that describe
8 DNAPL in more detail to folks that are not
9 familiar with this particular material,
10 just for example, to give you a better idea
11 of what we are dealing with at the site. I
12 also have an example over here that you can
13 take a look at.

14 The other reason why we are
15 having this presentation, as Heriberto
16 mentioned, is to provide the community an
17 opportunity to comment on this proposed
18 plant. Let me make it clear. I am
19 basically repeating what Heriberto said, is
20 that this is an interim plan to address a
21 specific area, a concern at the site,
22 specifically with regards to the source of
23 groundwater contamination.

24 Before I move forward, I would

1 like to just briefly acknowledge the
2 members of the team, the EPA and State
3 team.

4 I have on my left Peter Felitti,
5 our counsel, regional counsel from the EPA.

6 I have Paul Lake, our state
7 advisor, technical advisor. Paul, nice to
8 see you.

9 I have Dave Klatt, our
10 consultant from CH2M HILL who provides
11 technical advice to the EPA.

12 And, of course, Heriberto León
13 who is in charge of community involvement.

14 The one thing I want to add is
15 that the Illinois EPA does support the
16 preferred approach that we are going to be
17 describing in this brief presentation. So
18 let's go ahead.

19 Rather than state this at the
20 end of our presentation, I want to just
21 describe to you what our preferred
22 alternative or preferred approach would be
23 under the document that was recently
24 approved by EPA, produced by North Shore

1 Gas or Integrys. I am sorry. What we are
2 preferring, what our preferred approach
3 would be is what we -- what is described in
4 the document as a physically-enhanced DNAPL
5 recovery, also called D5 in the Focus
6 Feasibility Study.

7 What it basically entails is to
8 install a series of horizontal wells into
9 the DNAPL and the groundwater region. We
10 are going to be injecting treated
11 groundwater to help push the DNAPL into
12 recovery wells. We are going to pump
13 collected DNAPL from the wells, treat the
14 groundwater on-site prior to reinjecting it
15 to create this hydraulic gradient to push
16 the DNAPL into these recovery wells. We
17 are going to ship the DNAPL off-site for
18 treatment and disposal. And this
19 particular alternative that we are
20 proposing is going to take 8 years at a
21 cost of approximately \$10.6 million.

22 Briefly just to give you
23 graphically a concept of what is going to
24 happen, you are seeing -- sorry. You are

1 seeing the construction of these wells,
2 these white circles out here. These are
3 injection wells at the corners over here.
4 You have these parallel recovery wells --
5 extraction wells, I am sorry, extraction
6 wells here, one in the groundwater region
7 and one in the DNAPL region. Essentially
8 the concept is to create or increase the
9 gradient in the groundwater to help push
10 the DNAPL into these recovery wells. And
11 you would also -- so you have these
12 recovery wells taking out the -- well,
13 collecting the groundwater, and through
14 these sumps you could collect the DNAPL.

15 This is a picture, and I have to
16 apologize, it is not very clear, is the
17 system for treating groundwater. I think
18 it is separating the groundwater from the
19 DNAPL. So this is sort of just the layout
20 of the area.

21 Just for informational purposes,
22 this is sort of the picture of the site,
23 just an overview. I think I have an error
24 in here. This one shouldn't be included.

1 It was just corrected. So this particular
2 breakwater, this is part of the Port
3 District Authority, is in error as being
4 part of the site. So ignore this.

5 The area itself is approximately
6 about 22, 23 acres, and it is essentially
7 composed of the former manufactured gas
8 plant site which is approximately 2 acres.

9 The main road here is Pershing Road. You
10 have the Elgin Joliet and Eastern Railroad
11 track here, the Waukegan Port District
12 Authority property here. You have a small
13 strip of City of Waukegan property here.
14 And this large area is owned by Akzo-Nobel.

15 Just to give you a sense of what
16 each of these sites looks like, these
17 parcels of land -- could you lower the
18 lights? Is that better for you folks?

19 So this is basically what you
20 are looking at from a street level view.
21 You have this vacant lot, 2-acre lot which
22 is where the former manufactured gas plant
23 was in its heyday. It is now a vacant lot.
24 You have the Akzo-Nobel facility. You have

1 the administrative building from the Port
2 District. You have the maintenance
3 building. And looking east, you are
4 looking at this beautiful marina, the
5 Waukegan Harbor Marina, the south harbor I
6 believe.

7 Just to give you sort of a sense
8 of a timeline, the manufactured gas plant
9 was constructed in 1897. Owned by North
10 Shore Gas in 1900. Its successor was
11 Integrys from 2006 to the present. The
12 plant basically operated for about 50 years
13 until it was eventually demolished in the
14 early '50s. There was a bunch of State
15 inspections that occurred in the '90s,
16 along with gas company investigations
17 stretching all the way to 2007.

18 At somewhere around 2003, 2004,
19 under the State's voluntary cleanup
20 program, the gas company did some cleanup
21 at the former gas plant which basically
22 involved excavating a significant volume of
23 contaminated soil and materials at the
24 site. The blue -- And, again, I have to

1 apologize, you can't read it. But there is
2 poster boards over there that give you a
3 better sense of the depth of the
4 excavation.

5 But the blue basically
6 represents, I think, down to 3 and a half
7 feet. And I think this fuchsia colored one
8 is, I don't know, is that about, close to
9 the water table, this particular area. But
10 there was some significant level of --
11 significant amount of work back in 2003,
12 2004 involving the excavation of this
13 contaminated soil and debris that occurred
14 at this former gas plant site.

15 I believe there was also a
16 barrier wall that was constructed somewhere
17 out here. But we can get down to specifics
18 later on.

19 Continuing the timeline, in 2006
20 the parent company, Integrys, approached
21 EPA about being put under the Superfund
22 program, cleanup program. We agreed. In
23 2007 we reached settlement with the company
24 to conduct an RI/FS through an

1 administrative order on consent. The
2 actual field work for conducting the
3 investigation started somewhere around 2009
4 and ended in 2012. There was an extensive
5 sampling going on at the site. I think
6 there was like 12, 13, 14 rounds of
7 sampling at the site.

8 The EPA received or approved the
9 Remedial Investigation Report, the RI
10 report, in January of 2014. Some of the
11 highlights of the report basically found
12 that contaminants of concern were found
13 in -- which drove the risk at the site were
14 found in the soil, the groundwater, soil
15 vapor. NAPL is really the source of the
16 contamination. But the type of
17 contaminants that we saw in this media
18 included these set of compounds usually
19 associated with the burning of organic
20 material such as coal, wood, paper, that
21 kind of stuff, creating these set of
22 compounds called polynuclear aromatic
23 hydrocarbons, such as naphthalene,
24 chrysene, benzo(ghi)perylene. You also

1 have a group of compounds called BTEX,
2 benzene, ethylbenzene and xylene. You have
3 metals, such as arsenic and lead. So you
4 found these types of contaminants in these
5 media that were driving the risks at the
6 site.

7 Speaking of risk, the remedial
8 investigation, the risk assessment portion
9 of that report suggested that potential
10 risks were potentially risks to humans
11 through incidental ingestion or dermal
12 contact were possibly through contaminated
13 soil and groundwater as well as inhalation
14 of contaminated vapors. I am sorry about
15 the misspelling here. From the ecological
16 standpoint, there were potential ecological
17 risks due through exposure to sediment and
18 surface water.

19 Continuing the timeline, we
20 approved the Focus Feasibility Study, the
21 FFS, in April, on April 9 of this year,
22 specifically with regards to addressing the
23 DNAPL. And the proposed plan which talks
24 about the EPA's preferred alternative which

1 is contained -- which is included in the --
2 which is in the site repository in our
3 administrative record was approved on April
4 29, 2015, less than a month ago. So that
5 is sort of the timeline.

6 Just to give you a sense of
7 breadth of what we are dealing with as far
8 as DNAPL, here is sort of a map, a
9 distribution by thickness of the DNAPL. If
10 you take a look at the legend over here,
11 the most -- the thickest part of the DNAPL
12 region is centered here near the Port
13 District Authority location and also
14 somewhere close to where the former
15 manufactured gas plant site is located. So
16 these are the thickest DNAPL regions that
17 you would find. These blue dots represent
18 monitoring wells if I am not mistaken.
19 There was an extensive monitoring well
20 network out here.

21 Just to give you a sense of what
22 we are dealing with here, the latest
23 estimate that we have based on some recent
24 calculations in the Focus Feasibility Study

1 suggested that we are dealing with
2 approximately 500,000 gallons of DNAPL
3 material underneath the site, pretty
4 extensive.

5 This is sort of a graphical
6 representation of what the remedial
7 investigation found. I basically just went
8 through this quickly with you in the
9 previous slide. What we are seeing here is
10 the presence of the DNAPL contributing to
11 groundwater contamination at the site which
12 causes it to exceed the EPA's and the
13 State's screening levels generally set at
14 10 to the minus 6th, 1 in a million. You
15 have the water table in here. The
16 contamination in the groundwater also
17 influences the -- the soil vapor exceeding
18 screening levels which could possibly
19 affect -- be seen in the maintenance
20 building, the Port District maintenance
21 building. Just to kind of give you a sense
22 of groundwater direction, groundwater flows
23 from west to east towards the lake.

24 You have a clay layer over here

1 which is probably about 15 to 20 feet below
2 ground surface. You have the water table
3 here probably around, I would say, about 7
4 feet below ground surface, BGS. So that is
5 sort of a very simplified representation of
6 what is going on at the site.

7 There is more details, of
8 course, in the Remedial Investigation
9 Report if you care to read it. It is in
10 the repository if you are interested in
11 getting more details.

12 What is a DNAPL? Well, I put up
13 this slide to sort of give you a sense of
14 what we are dealing with over here.

15 Generally a DNAPL is a liquid that does not
16 really mix with water and whose density is
17 greater than water, what we call sinkers.

18 A DNAPL could be creosote, coal tar,
19 chlorinated solvents such as
20 trichloroethylene, PCBs. These are
21 pictures of what the DNAPL would look like.

22 I have a sample of this if you
23 want to take a look at it, what a DNAPL
24 would look like. I got that at one of

1 those seminars in there. It is a nice
2 representation.

3 Sometimes it is hard to sort of
4 describe what we are dealing with as far as
5 DNAPL. So I sort of created this graph to
6 kind of simplify it. So this is what you
7 would expect some of the examples of what
8 the material is.

9 Why are we addressing DNAPL?
10 Well, primarily it is the source of the
11 site-wide groundwater contamination. And
12 groundwater is basically -- the
13 contaminated groundwater is driving the
14 risk at the site. We can't really restore
15 groundwater quality until we address the
16 DNAPL which is the source of the
17 contamination.

18 Our Superfund regulations have
19 an expectation that, whenever it is
20 practicable, that we restore groundwater to
21 beneficial use within a reasonable time
22 frame. And, you know, if we don't address
23 the source of the groundwater
24 contamination, you can't possibly meet that

1 goal of restoring groundwater to beneficial
2 use. So it is really important that you
3 address the contaminant source.

4 DNAPL in the agency's, I guess,
5 designation is referred to as principal
6 threat waste. And the expectation when you
7 deal with principal threat waste is to
8 treat it. And, you know, actively treat it
9 as opposed to containing it through some
10 sort of engineering control.

11 So these are sort of the three
12 major points of why we need to address
13 DNAPL. It is in the law. It is in the
14 regulations. And it is a way for us to get
15 a cleanup for the groundwater in the
16 future.

17 Our cleanup objective in the
18 report Focus Feasibility Study is stated as
19 reduce the mass and mobility of recoverable
20 DNAPL to the extent practicable. That's
21 what is -- that's the exact wording that we
22 have in the Focus Feasibility Study.

23 Now, getting to the meat of the
24 presentation, the various remedial

1 alternatives that we evaluated that were
2 sort of described in the feasibility study
3 that we approved back in late April involve
4 these various alternatives. One which is
5 prescribed, you have to always have this as
6 part of your alternatives, is the no action
7 alternative.

8 The other alternatives that we
9 are dealing with or that we have evaluated
10 include just using institutional controls
11 which involves restricting the use of
12 groundwater and a management plan for
13 intrusive activities. There is nothing
14 specific about this. This will -- You
15 know, you are going to get -- if this
16 particular option is chosen, then we would
17 get down to getting more details and just
18 figuring out how we can get these types of
19 controls in place. These are
20 non-engineering controls.

21 One other option that was
22 considered in the Focus Feasibility Study
23 was to construct a vertical engineered
24 barrier. There are various types that were

1 being proposed in the report. The types
2 that were looked at or described include
3 soil bentonite, high-density polyethylene,
4 or steel sheet piling. This particular
5 barrier, engineered barrier wall is going
6 to be installed down to the clay layer
7 which I believe is on the average about 15
8 feet below ground surface.

9 The other alternatives that were
10 considered include a horizontal well DNAPL
11 recovery. You have this which is our
12 preferred approach, the physically-enhanced
13 DNAPL recovery. You have a
14 chemically-enhanced DNAPL recovery where it
15 is essentially the same as these, D4 and
16 D5, with the addition of surfactants to
17 enhance the separation of DNAPL and have a
18 greater removal efficiency. You also have
19 thermally-enhanced recovery using electric
20 resistance heating, ERH.

21 How do we evaluate the
22 alternatives? The EPA uses a -- what it
23 refers as to the nine-criteria evaluation
24 which is composed of two primary components

1 here, five balancing criteria, and two what
2 we consider as modifying criteria.

3 The threshold criteria which
4 every remedy must meet in order to be
5 considered or in order to be chosen is
6 protecting human health and environment and
7 attaining what we refer to as applicable or
8 relevant and appropriate requirements or
9 ARARs which are more federal and more
10 stringent state requirements, such as
11 cleanup standards, standards of control,
12 other things which address the various
13 circumstances at the site, you know, the
14 type of contaminants that you have, the
15 location, what type of remedial action you
16 are dealing with. So attaining ARARs and
17 protecting human health and environment are
18 what we consider as threshold criteria
19 which an alternative must meet in order to
20 be considered or in order to be chosen.

21 Then there is just the balancing
22 criteria that we looked at, long-term
23 effectiveness and permanence, reduction of
24 toxicity, mobility and volume, short-term

1 effectiveness, the implementability of each
2 alternative, and the cost. These are
3 further defined in the feasibility study if
4 you are interested, all of these criteria.

5 And the modifying criteria will
6 also be taken into consideration. But
7 these will be -- you know, these types of
8 criteria can only be evaluated after we go
9 through this public comment period.

10 Now, as far as actually applying
11 these criteria, there is really a two-step
12 process according to the Superfund
13 guidelines. You evaluate each alternative
14 individually against the evaluation
15 criteria. Again, I must, you know, just
16 mention that you have to meet the threshold
17 criteria which are these first two.

18 Then the criteria must be
19 compared against each other, comparative
20 analysis of alternatives against evaluation
21 criteria. Identify advantages and
22 disadvantages of each alternative relative
23 to one another. So these are the two sort
24 of discussions that you would find in the

1 feasibility study.

2 After you are done going through
3 the evaluation criteria, this is what you
4 generally would see in a report for EPA as
5 part of a Focus Feasibility Study. You are
6 going through the evaluation. Do you meet
7 the criteria? Do you not meet the
8 criteria? There is also, in this
9 particular case as far as short-term
10 effectiveness, there was some information
11 with regards to how long it would take to
12 meet the cleanup objective.

13 So as a result of this -- well,
14 the EPA basically proposes its preferred
15 approach using the best balanced, based on
16 the best balance when compared to the
17 criteria.

18 Our rationale for proposing D5
19 is a couple-fold. One is the significant
20 reduction in time frame comparing it to
21 the -- through one of the options, D4, the
22 horizontal well DNAPL recovery, 8 years
23 versus 31 years which is quite significant
24 with a moderate increase in cost from about

1 4.6 to about \$10.6 million, 4.7 to 10.6.

2 We also see a permanent reduction in DNAPL
3 volume when comparing it to just
4 institutional controls or the vertical
5 engineered barrier. Using D5 also allows
6 us for a suitable remedy of groundwater in
7 a final record of decision. So those are
8 three of the major reasons why we believe
9 the preferred alternative D5 is what we are
10 proposing.

11 What are the next steps after
12 this public meeting? Well, we are going to
13 be collecting. We are going to be
14 preparing our response to the comments that
15 we receive from all interested parties. We
16 are going to include that in a record, a
17 decision for DNAPL.

18 I have to also mention that this
19 particular record of decision is an interim
20 action -- for an interim action to just
21 specifically address DNAPL. We are going
22 to be issuing a final record of decision
23 for the whole site which addresses the
24 groundwater, the soil, and the other media

1 with unacceptable risks. We are going to
2 negotiate cleanup with the company. This
3 should be Integrys. My apologies, Naren.
4 We are going to prepare a design for the
5 remedy, whichever is chosen through the
6 negotiated agreement. We are going to
7 construct the -- the party is going to
8 construct and operate the DNAPL remedy.

9 Again, as far as the next steps,
10 we are going to be -- the EPA is going to
11 be evaluating the remedy performance.

12 There are steps and procedures in the Focus
13 Feasibility Study where we are going to be
14 monitoring the performance of whatever
15 chosen remedy there is. And there is a way
16 to determine if enhancements are necessary,
17 whether you are going to go -- whether you
18 need to go with a more aggressive approach.

19 It all depends on whether that -- the
20 decision criteria says it is needed. You
21 are not meeting the performance standard.

22 It is taking too long, those kinds of
23 considerations. So there are performance
24 measures that need to be met, and there are

1 ways to move the more aggressive approaches
2 if necessary.

3 Like I said, we are going to
4 evaluate and propose the cleanup
5 alternatives for the remaining media of
6 concern, such as groundwater, soil, soil
7 vapor. When that thing is done, we are
8 going to be issuing a final ROD for those
9 media.

10 Again, as we did with the DNAPL,
11 we are going to be negotiating a cleanup
12 agreement with Integrys, North Shore Gas.
13 And we are going to go ahead hopefully
14 through a negotiated settlement to
15 construct and operate the final remedy.

16 That's my presentation. You can
17 open it up for questions and answers.
18 Thank you.

19 MR. LEÓN: Thank you, Ross. I
20 think we can move to just actually having
21 both questions and answers as well as any
22 comments.

23 MR. ELEY: My gas bill still
24 comes out labeled North Shore Gas.

1 MR. DEL ROSARIO: Is that a
2 comment?

3 MR. ELEY: Yes. So it might be
4 owned by somebody else, but they are still
5 doing business as North Shore Gas.

6 MS. OWEN: I have a question,
7 and I have several comments.

8 MR. LEÓN: Do you want to state
9 your name and spell it?

10 MS. OWEN: My name is Verena
11 Owen, V-E-R-E-N-A, O-W-E-N. I live in
12 Winthrop Harbor, but my husband and I have
13 roots in Waukegan. We lived here for a
14 little bit. He was a teacher in Waukegan,
15 retired a couple of years ago. We have a
16 boat in the Waukegan Harbor. My heart has
17 always been in Waukegan. I am always
18 interested in what is happening here. So
19 thank you very much for this meeting
20 tonight.

21 I do have a question about one
22 of your slides. I simply didn't
23 understand. There was a slide where you
24 had the three reasons on it. The last one

1 was something about groundwater. I am not
2 sure I really understood what you were
3 trying to say. If you could perhaps pull
4 it up again and show it again?

5 MR. DEL ROSARIO: Sure.

6 MS. OWEN: I think that one.
7 Yes, that one. What does the last point
8 mean? I am not sure I understand that.

9 MR. DEL ROSARIO: Well, it talks
10 about the fact that you have -- well, there
11 is going to be a problem trying to find a
12 suitable remedy for groundwater if you have
13 a continuing source of contamination at the
14 site.

15 MS. OWEN: I thought that's what
16 this was all about, to find that remedy.
17 So I don't understand that point.

18 MR. DEL ROSARIO: This preferred
19 approach that we are dealing with here is
20 an interim action to address the source of
21 the contamination. We are going to be
22 issuing a decision on how to address that
23 source of contamination for the
24 groundwater. Down the road we are going to

1 be issuing a final record of decision to
2 address the groundwater, the soil, and the
3 soil vapor.

4 So it is sort of a phased
5 approach where you want to address the
6 source of the contamination first. Stop
7 that. Let the groundwater heal. And it
8 would put you in a position of finding a
9 suitable remedy for the groundwater.
10 That's basically what we are talking about
11 here.

12 MS. OWEN: Thank you. That
13 explains it. Would that be parallel
14 processes, or would that be you do one
15 thing first and then the next phase?

16 MR. DEL ROSARIO: That's a good
17 question.

18 MS. OWEN: I have lots of those.

19 MR. DEL ROSARIO: The good thing
20 is that before we embark on the focus on
21 doing this interim action for DNAPL, we did
22 have a feasibility study that talked about
23 the various alternatives for all of the
24 media. There is a lot of information in

1 that old feasibility study which we are
2 going to be using to kind of continue this
3 conversation with the gas company as we
4 move along here. There is a lot of
5 information and experience already that has
6 been developed over the past couple years
7 as we go along this investigation and
8 developing alternatives. It is not like we
9 are starting from scratch.

10 MS. OWEN: When was that study
11 done, do you happen to know?

12 MR. DEL ROSARIO: I believe that
13 the previous feasibility study was done
14 back in May of 2014.

15 MS. OWEN: You said old. It
16 wasn't like 20 years ago?

17 MR. LEÓN: It seems like 20
18 years.

19 MR. DEL ROSARIO: I could be
20 wrong about 2014. When we reviewed the
21 data, it was quite extensive data,
22 information that was provided to us, we
23 realized that we couldn't move forward on
24 coming up with a final remedy until we

1 dealt with this particular issue.

2 MS. OWEN: Thank you. I don't
3 want to -- I would be happy to sit down and
4 let other people.

5 MR. LEÓN: No. You are okay.

6 MS. OWEN: I forgot in my
7 introduction that I am a member of the
8 Sierra Club and I am a member of Clean
9 Power Lake County. But I am speaking for
10 myself tonight just to be clear because
11 some of you know which organizations I
12 belong to.

13 My question is, is there a
14 current public -- does it currently pose
15 any public danger? You talked about vapors
16 and contaminated soil, the site. Does it?

17 MR. DEL ROSARIO: Could you
18 repeat the question?

19 MS. OWEN: Yes. Does the site
20 currently pose any public health danger?
21 You mentioned vapors and contaminated soil.
22 This is -- Some of the site, people can
23 walk there. They can sit there. They can
24 read there. Is there some public danger?

1 MR. DEL ROSARIO: We talk about
2 potential risk and dangers when you disturb
3 the ground, particularly with regards to
4 construction workers out there. But if you
5 don't disturb the ground, you really
6 don't -- are not exposing yourself to that
7 particular contamination.

8 MS. OWEN: Vapors? But vapors
9 can come up through the soil.

10 MR. DEL ROSARIO: There were
11 specific areas in the Remedial
12 Investigation Report which suggested that
13 there may be potential risks in the
14 maintenance building. But my understanding
15 is that the maintenance building, the Port
16 District's maintenance building has a vapor
17 mitigation system. So they do have a
18 system, as far as we understand, of
19 addressing the vapors.

20 MS. OWEN: Are there currently
21 like monitoring probes to see if anything
22 mitigates off-site into the parking lot or
23 the other building, and do you think that
24 would be necessary?

1 MR. DEL ROSARIO: My
2 understanding is that there is ongoing
3 sampling, periodic sampling out at the
4 site.

5 MS. OWEN: Air sampling?

6 MR. DEL ROSARIO: We have
7 groundwater sampling that continues on a
8 semiannual basis twice a year.

9 MS. OWEN: Air?

10 MR. DEL ROSARIO: Yes, air
11 sampling. I don't believe we -- air is an
12 issue at the site.

13 MR. FELITTI: There is not going
14 to be a problem with vapors unless it is in
15 the building. If it is dissipating to the
16 outside, it is not going to be a risk.

17 MS. OWEN: Really?

18 MR. FELITTI: From this site it
19 is not going to be a risk, no.

20 MS. OWEN: I read all the things
21 that he mentioned. None of them sounded
22 particularly healthy to me.

23 MR. FELITTI: The levels that
24 they would be coming out would not be --

1 MS. OWEN: So you know the level
2 that is coming out?

3 MR. FELITTI: That's the
4 analysis that we did to determine what the
5 risk levels were. The risk factor is in
6 the building, it is possible --

7 MS. OWEN: Plus, it would
8 collect. I understand that.

9 MR. FELITTI: It would collect.

10 MS. OWEN: So how long did this
11 plant operate?

12 MR. DEL ROSARIO: Well,
13 according to the information we had, you
14 are talking about the gas plant operations?

15 MS. OWEN: Yes.

16 MR. DEL ROSARIO: Well, it
17 started -- it was constructed in 1897. And
18 it continued operations until 1946, roughly
19 50 years.

20 MS. OWEN: Is that about the
21 same time that the North Plant operated,
22 just about?

23 MR. DEL ROSARIO: I can't tell
24 you right now. I have to take a look at

1 the document. I don't know --

2 MS. OWEN: I remember it was
3 built before the turn of the century. I
4 just don't know.

5 MR. DEL ROSARIO: I don't know.
6 I will have to look back and take a look at
7 the information.

8 MS. OWEN: So when was a problem
9 first detected at the North Plant?

10 MR. DEL ROSARIO: Well, this
11 discussion centers on the South Plant. You
12 are dealing with the North Plant. I can
13 answer your question later. But I -- I am
14 not in a position to answer the question
15 with regards to the North Plant. I don't
16 have --

17 MS. OWEN: I understand.

18 MR. DEL ROSARIO: -- my
19 documents here.

20 MS. OWEN: It seems that the
21 North Plant cleanup is further advanced
22 than this one. I was just trying to figure
23 out why.

24 MR. DEL ROSARIO: It is a good

1 question. We can certainly talk later. I
2 can give you the facts. I don't have it
3 with me right now.

4 MS. OWEN: I understand. You
5 said I could ask questions. You didn't say
6 you had to have all the answers.

7 MR. DEL ROSARIO: I try.

8 MR. ELEY: The North Plant site,
9 there was no building on the site. And
10 there are buildings on the South Plant
11 site.

12 MR. DEL ROSARIO: Yes.

13 MR. ELEY: Which is going to
14 hinder things, makes it more complicated.

15 MR. DEL ROSARIO: I can't answer
16 that question right now. We are not at the
17 particular stage.

18 MS. OWEN: Well, at sometime
19 somebody noticed something because I
20 believe the Illinois EPA was the first one
21 that did some kind of investigation out
22 there? Yes? I am looking at the wrong
23 person. I am sorry. You are the
24 consultant. Sorry.

1 MR. LAKE: I am Paul Lake from
2 the Illinois EPA. Yes, we did do initial
3 investigations out there in the '90s. And
4 North Shore Gas got into our voluntary
5 cleanup program as Ross described. And
6 through cooperative efforts, they did
7 remove the top layer of soil out at the
8 site.

9 MS. OWEN: Did you look at the
10 groundwater at the time?

11 MR. LAKE: I don't believe that
12 was part of the initial investigations, but
13 eventually they did. That's how they
14 discovered the amount of DNAPL or the
15 product that is out there, yes.

16 MS. OWEN: Well, looking that it
17 is now 2015, so this all started 25 years
18 ago. That seems a very long time for
19 something to sit there and no action. I am
20 sorry, guys. I don't understand that. You
21 don't have to answer. That was a comment.

22 Having lived here since the mid
23 '80s or nearby, I have been to countless of
24 these meetings. It always amazes me that

1 you are not done. It amazes me how long
2 this takes and how much longer they take,
3 and then there is yet another step. Then
4 we are finally ready to give it back,
5 something goes wrong. It is extremely
6 frustrating and quite frightening to me
7 that these things continue to happen.

8 So I have a question about the
9 remediation option that you all picked.

10 MR. DEL ROSARIO: Let me make a
11 correction. Nothing has been chosen. We
12 are proposing.

13 MS. OWEN: The best, whatever
14 you want to call it.

15 MR. DEL ROSARIO: The preferred.

16 MS. OWEN: Preferred is fine.
17 So I have two questions about that. So if
18 money was not a consideration, which one of
19 those is the best one in all your experts?

20 MR. FELITTI: Money is a
21 consideration as well.

22 MS. OWEN: I just said if there
23 was --

24 MR. FELITTI: We don't look at

1 it that way.

2 MS. OWEN: I don't really --
3 yes, I understand that. But as a person
4 who is not really all that technically
5 savvy and I have all these experts in the
6 room, I thought today was the time to
7 really ask that question of you all because
8 I don't know the answer. But most all of
9 you here do know. So let me repeat it.
10 And I hear you that money has to be part of
11 the decision.

12 My question is, just looking at
13 the technical options, which one is the
14 best?

15 MR. FELITTI: I would say
16 probably D4 then if you are saying money is
17 not an issue. Just do the one that
18 collects it over 30 years.

19 MS. OWEN: Are you being
20 serious?

21 MR. FELITTI: You are saying
22 that money is not the issue --

23 MS. OWEN: Yes.

24 MR. FELITTI: -- and just

1 looking at the --

2 MS. OWEN: If you could spend
3 all the money in the world, which one is
4 the best option?

5 MR. FELITTI: If you spent all
6 the money in the world, then I would say
7 dig the thing up and spend \$100 million. I
8 wouldn't pick any of these remedies.

9 MS. OWEN: That was not --

10 MR. FELITTI: But that is an
11 irrelevant answer because it can't be done.

12 MS. OWEN: It might not be a
13 relevant answer, but I think it was a
14 relevant question. Thank you.

15 Actually, I think after that
16 kind of criticism of my questioning, I
17 think I am going to sit down because that
18 wasn't very nice and not very welcoming of
19 people. We take the risk to stand here in
20 front of you all and ask questions, and we
21 get pushback like that.

22 Thank you very much. I am going
23 to leave now.

24 MR. ELEY: D4 was a lot cheaper.

1 The only thing is it takes --

2 MR. LEÓN: Did you want to make
3 a comment, sir? You are on the record. We
4 do have a court reporter, and we want to
5 make sure that we record your name
6 accurately.

7 MR. ELEY: William Eley,
8 E-L-E-Y.

9 And my comment was that D4 only
10 would cost 4 million instead of 10 million.
11 But instead of 8 years, it would take 31.
12 That's -- anything can happen in 31 years.
13 The sooner it is done, the more likely it
14 is to be done.

15 MR. LEÓN: You are the only
16 member of the public that is left. Unless
17 you have any other comments?

18 MR. ELEY: No. It has been
19 interesting.

20 MR. LEÓN: Did you want to wait
21 out a little bit longer, or should we go
22 ahead and end?

23 MR. DEL ROSARIO: We have
24 another meeting tomorrow.

1 MR. LEÓN: We do have another
2 meeting tomorrow, and we didn't really
3 announce the closing. We just said the
4 meeting was at 6:00. I would presume that
5 if people weren't here at 6:00, that they
6 are not going to show up at 7:30.

7 MR. DEL ROSARIO: Do we have a
8 closing time?

9 MR. LEÓN: No.

10 MR. DEL ROSARIO: What's the
11 thing with regard to meetings, that I
12 recommend that we?

13 MR. LEÓN: You don't need to
14 adjourn here. We can close the record.

15

16 (Meeting ended at 6:51
17 p.m.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2) SS:
3 COUNTY OF L A K E)
4
5
6
7

8 I, Carrie McCann, CSR,
9 Certified Shorthand Reporter, and a notary
10 public in and for the County of Lake and
11 State of Illinois, do hereby certify that
12 the testimony given in the proceedings
13 before on May 20, 2015 was recorded
14 stenographically by me and transcribed by
15 me.

16 I FURTHER CERTIFY that the
17 foregoing transcript of said proceedings is
18 a true, correct, and complete transcript of
19 the testimony given by the said witnesses
20 at the time and place specified.

21 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not
22 a relative or employee or attorney or
23 employee of such attorney or counsel, or
24 financially interested directly or

1 indirectly in this action.

2 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have set
3 my hand.

4
5
6
7 

8 Carrie McCann
9 Carrie McCann
10 Certified Shorthand Reporter
11 Certificate No. 84-004374
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

\$	30 39:18	action 19:6 21:15 24:20 28:20 29:21 37:19	alternatives 19:1, 4,6,8 20:9,22 22:20 26:5 29:23 30:8	average 20:7
\$10.6 7:21 24:1	31 23:23 41:11,12	actively 18:8	amazes 37:24 38:1	B
\$100 40:7	4	activities 19:13	amount 11:11 37:14	back 4:9 11:11 19:3 30:14 35:6 38:4
1	4 41:10	actual 12:2	analysis 22:20 34:4	balance 23:16
1 15:14	4.6 24:1	add 6:14	announce 42:3	balanced 23:15
10 15:14 41:10	4.7 24:1	addition 20:16	answers 26:17,21 36:6	balancing 21:1,21
10.6 24:1	5	additional 4:9	apologies 25:3	barrier 11:16 19:24 20:5 24:5
12 12:6	5 3:6 4:7,12	address 5:4,20 17:15,22 18:3,12 21:12 24:21 28:20, 22 29:2,5	apologize 8:16 11:1	based 3:6 14:23 23:15
13 12:6	50 10:12 34:19	addressed 4:4	applicable 21:7	basically 5:19 7:7 9:19 10:12,21 11:5 12:11 15:7 17:12 23:14 29:10
14 12:6	500,000 15:2	addresses 24:23	applying 22:10	basis 33:8
15 16:1 20:7	50s 10:14	addressing 13:22 17:9 32:19	approach 5:2 6:16,22 7:2 20:12 23:15 25:18 28:19 29:5	beautiful 10:4
1897 10:9 34:17	6	adjourn 42:14	approached 11:20	belong 31:12
1900 10:10	6 4:7	administrative 10:1 12:1 14:3	approaches 26:1	beneficial 17:21 18:1
1946 34:18	6:00 42:4,5	advanced 35:21	approved 6:24 12:8 13:20 14:3 19:3	bentonite 20:3
2	6:51 42:16	advantages 22:21	approximately 7:21 9:5,8 15:2	benzene 13:2
2 9:8	6th 15:14	advice 6:11	April 13:21 14:3 19:3	benzo(ghi) perylene 12:24
2-acre 9:21	7	advisor 6:7	ARARS 21:9,16	BGS 16:4
20 16:1 30:16,17	7 16:3	affect 15:19	area 5:21 8:20 9:5, 14 11:9	bill 26:23
2003 10:18 11:11	7:30 42:6	Agency 3:5	areas 32:11	bit 27:14 41:21
2004 10:18 11:12	8	agency's 18:4	aromatic 12:22	blue 10:24 11:5 14:17
2006 10:11 11:19	8 7:20 23:22 41:11	aggressive 25:18 26:1	arsonic 13:3	boards 11:2
2007 10:17 11:23	80s 37:23	agreed 11:22	assessment 13:8	boat 27:16
2009 12:3	9	agreement 25:6 26:12	assigned 4:20	breadth 14:7
2012 12:4	9 13:21	ahead 4:13 6:18 26:13 41:22	attaining 21:7,16	breakwater 9:2
2014 12:10 30:14, 20	90s 10:15 37:3	air 33:5,9,10,11	Authority 9:3,12 14:13	briefly 6:1 7:22
2015 14:4 37:17	A	Akzo-nobel 9:14, 24		BTEX 13:1
22 9:6	accurately 3:22 41:6	alternative 6:22 7:19 13:24 19:7 21:19 22:2,13,22 24:9		building 10:1,3 15:20,21 32:14,15, 16,23 33:15 34:6 36:9
23 9:6	acknowledge 6:1			
25 37:17	acres 9:6,8			
29 14:4				
3				
3 11:6				

buildings 36:10	31:10	consent 12:1	coordinator 3:4	debris 11:13
built 35:3	close 11:8 14:14 42:14	consideration 22:6 38:18,21	copies 4:9	decision 24:7,17, 19,22 25:20 28:22 29:1 39:11
bunch 10:14	closing 42:3,8	considerations 25:23	corners 8:3	defined 22:3
burning 12:19	Club 31:8	considered 19:22 20:10 21:5,20	corrected 9:1	Del 3:12 4:14,16, 19 27:1 28:5,9,18 29:16,19 30:12,19 31:17 32:1,10 33:1,6,10 34:12, 16,23 35:5,10,18, 24 36:7,12,15 38:10,15 41:23 42:7,10
business 27:5	coal 12:20 16:18	construct 19:23 25:7,8 26:15	correction 38:11	
<hr/> C <hr/>	collect 8:14 34:8,9	constructed 10:9 11:16 34:17	cost 7:21 22:2 23:24 41:10	
calculations 14:24	collected 7:13	construction 8:1 32:4	counsel 6:5	
call 5:4 16:17 38:14	collecting 8:13 24:13	consultant 6:10 36:24	countless 37:23	
called 7:5 12:22 13:1	collects 39:18	contact 13:12	County 31:9	
care 16:9	colored 11:7	contained 14:1	couple 27:15 30:6	
case 23:9	comment 4:6 5:17 22:9 27:2 37:21 41:3,9	contaminant 18:3	couple-fold 23:19	demolished 10:13
centered 14:12	comments 3:18, 21,23,24 4:2,12 24:14 26:22 27:7 41:17	contaminants 12:12,17 13:4 21:14	court 3:19 41:4	dense 5:5
centers 35:11	community 3:4 5:16 6:13	contaminated 10:23 11:13 13:12, 14 17:13 31:16,21	create 7:15 8:8	density 16:16
century 35:3	company 10:16, 20 11:20,23 25:2 30:3	contamination 5:3,23 12:16 15:11,16 17:11,17, 24 28:13,21,23 29:6 32:7	created 17:5	depends 25:19
CH2M 6:10	comparative 22:19	continue 30:2 38:7	creating 12:21	depth 11:3
charge 6:13	compared 22:19 23:16	continued 34:18	creosote 16:18	dermal 13:11
cheaper 40:24	comparing 23:20 24:3	continues 33:7	criteria 21:1,2,3, 18,22 22:4,5,8,11, 15,17,18,21 23:3, 7,8,17 25:20	describe 5:2,7 6:21 17:4
chemically- enhanced 20:14	complicated 36:14	continuing 11:19 13:19 28:13	criticism 40:16	describing 6:17
Chicago 3:6	components 20:24	contributing 15:10	current 31:14	design 25:4
chlorinated 16:19	composed 9:7 20:24	control 18:10 21:11	<hr/> D <hr/>	designation 18:5
chosen 19:16 21:5,20 25:5,15 38:11	compounds 12:18,22 13:1	controls 19:10,19, 20 24:4	D4 20:15 23:21 39:16 40:24 41:9	detail 5:8
chrysene 12:24	concept 7:23 8:8	conversation 30:3	D5 7:5 20:16 23:18 24:5,9	details 16:7,11 19:17
circles 8:2	concern 5:21 12:12 26:6	cooperative 37:6	danger 31:15,20, 24	detected 35:9
circumstances 21:13	conduct 11:24		dangers 32:2	determine 25:16 34:4
City 9:13	conducting 12:2		data 30:21	developed 30:6
clay 15:24 20:6			Dave 6:9	developing 30:8
Clean 31:8			deal 5:3 18:7	dig 40:7
cleanup 3:8,15 10:19,20 11:22 18:15,17 21:11 23:12 25:2 26:4,11 35:21 37:5			dealing 5:11 14:7, 22 15:1 16:14 17:4 19:9 21:16 28:19 35:12	direction 15:22
clear 5:18 8:16			dealt 31:1	disadvantages 22:22
				discovered 37:14
				discussion 35:11
				discussions 22:24
				disposal 7:18

dissipating 33:15	end 6:20 41:22	excavation 11:4, 12	final 24:7,22 26:8, 15 29:1 30:24	gradient 7:15 8:9
distribution 14:9	ended 12:4 42:16	exceed 15:12	finally 38:4	graph 17:5
District 9:3,11 10:2 14:13 15:20	engineered 19:23 20:5 24:5	exceeding 15:17	find 14:17 22:24 28:11,16	graphical 15:5
District's 32:16	engineering 18:10	expect 17:7	finding 29:8	graphically 7:23
disturb 32:2,5	enhance 20:17	expectation 17:19 18:6	fine 38:16	greater 16:17 20:18
DNAPL 5:4,8 7:4, 9,11,13,16,17 8:7, 10,14,19 13:23 14:8,9,11,16 15:2, 10 16:12,15,18,21, 23 17:5,9,16 18:4, 13,20 20:10,13,14, 17 23:22 24:2,17, 21 25:8 26:10 29:21 37:14	enhancements 25:16	experience 30:5	flows 15:22	ground 16:2,4 20:8 32:3,5
document 6:23 7:4 35:1	entails 7:7	experts 38:19 39:5	focus 7:5 13:20 14:24 18:18,22 19:22 23:5 25:12 29:20	groundwater 5:23 7:9,11,14 8:6, 9,13,17,18 12:14 13:13 15:11,16,22 17:11,12,13,15,20, 23 18:1,15 19:12 24:6,24 26:6 28:1, 12,24 29:2,7,9 33:7 37:10
documents 35:19	entered 4:4	explains 29:13	folks 5:8 9:18	group 13:1
dots 14:17	entering 4:11	exposing 32:6	forgot 31:6	guess 18:4
driving 13:5 17:13	environment 21:6,17	exposure 13:17	forward 5:24 30:23	guidelines 22:13
drove 12:13	Environmental 3:5	extensive 12:4 14:19 15:4 30:21	found 12:11,12,14 13:4 15:7	guys 37:20
due 13:17	EPA 4:1,20 6:2,5, 11,15,24 11:21 12:8 20:22 23:4,14 25:10 36:20 37:2	extent 18:20	frame 17:22 23:20	
	EPA'S 3:7,12 5:2 13:24 15:12	extraction 8:5	frightening 38:6	H
	ERH 20:20	extremely 38:5	front 4:10 40:20	
E	error 8:23 9:3		frustrating 38:6	
E-I-e-y 41:8	essentially 5:1 8:7 9:6 20:15	facility 9:24	fuchsia 11:7	half 11:6
early 10:14	estimate 14:23	fact 28:10	future 18:16	happen 7:24 30:11 38:7 41:12
east 10:3 15:23	ethylbenzene 13:2	factor 34:5	G	happening 27:18
Eastern 9:10	evaluate 20:21 22:13 26:4	facts 36:2	gallons 15:2	happy 31:3
ecological 13:15, 16	evaluated 19:1,9 22:8	familiar 5:9	gas 3:9,10 4:22 7:1 9:7,22 10:8,10,16, 20,21 11:14 14:15 26:12,23,24 27:5 30:3 34:14 37:4	harbor 10:5 27:12, 16
effectiveness 21:23 22:1 23:10	evaluating 25:11	feasibility 7:6 13:20 14:24 18:18, 22 19:2,22 22:3 23:1,5 25:13 29:22 30:1,13	generally 15:13 16:15 23:4	hard 17:3
efficiency 20:18	evaluation 20:23 22:14,20 23:3,6	federal 21:9	gentlemen 4:18	heal 29:7
efforts 37:6	evening 3:2 4:17	feet 11:7 16:1,4 20:8	give 5:10 7:22 9:15 10:7 11:2 14:6,21 15:21 16:13 36:2 38:4	health 21:6,17 31:20
electric 20:19	eventually 10:13 37:13	Felitti 6:4 33:13, 18,23 34:3,9 38:20,24 39:15,21, 24 40:5,10	goal 18:1	healthy 33:22
electronically 4:3	exact 18:21	FFS 13:21	good 3:2 4:17 29:16,19 35:24	hear 39:10
Eley 26:23 27:3 36:8,13 40:24 41:7,18	examples 17:7	field 12:2		heart 27:16
Elgin 9:10	excavating 10:22	figure 35:22		heating 20:20
embark 29:20		figuring 19:18		Heriberto 3:3 4:17 5:15,19 6:12

highlights 12:11	inspections 17:6 30:2 36:21 40:16	long-term 21:22 42:11	
HILL 6:10	10:15	longer 38:2 41:21	member 31:7,8 41:16
hinder 36:14	install 7:8	looked 20:2 21:22	members 6:2
horizontal 7:8 20:10 23:22	installed 20:6	lot 9:21,23 29:24 30:4 32:22 40:24	mention 22:16 24:18
human 21:6,17	institutional 19:10 24:4	lots 29:18	mentioned 5:16 31:21 33:21
humans 13:10	Integrays 7:1 10:11 11:20 25:3 26:12	lower 9:17	met 25:24
husband 27:12	interested 16:10 22:4 24:15 27:18	M	metals 13:3
hydraulic 7:15	interesting 41:19	Mail 4:2	mid 37:22
hydrocarbons 12:23	interim 3:8 5:20 24:19,20 28:20 29:21	main 9:9	million 7:21 15:14 24:1 40:7 41:10
I	introduction 31:7	maintenance 10:2 15:19,20 32:14,15,16	minus 15:14
idea 5:10	intrusive 19:13	major 5:3 18:12 24:8	misspelling 13:15
Identify 22:21	investigation 12:3,9 13:8 15:7 16:8 30:7 32:12 36:21	make 3:14 4:14 5:18 38:10 41:2,5	mistaken 14:18
ignore 9:4	investigations 10:16 37:3,12	makes 36:14	mitigates 32:22
Illinois 4:23 6:15 36:20 37:2	involve 19:3	management 19:12	mitigation 32:17
implementability 22:1	involved 10:22	manager 3:13 4:20	mix 16:16
important 18:2	involvement 3:4 6:13	manufactured 3:9 4:22 9:7,22 10:8 14:15	mobility 18:19 21:24
incidental 13:11	involves 19:11	map 14:8	moderate 23:24
include 19:10 20:2,10 24:16	involving 11:12	marina 10:4,5	modifying 21:2 22:5
included 8:24 12:18 14:1	irrelevant 40:11	mass 18:19	money 38:18,20 39:10,16,22 40:3,6
increase 8:8 23:24	issue 31:1 33:12 39:17,22	material 5:9 12:20 15:3 17:8	monitoring 14:18, 19 25:14 32:21
individually 22:14	issued 4:5	materials 10:23	month 14:4
influences 15:17	issuing 24:22 26:8 28:22 29:1	measures 25:24	move 5:24 26:1,20 30:4,23
information 23:10 29:24 30:5,22 34:13 35:7	J	meat 18:23	N
informational 8:21	January 12:10	media 12:17 13:5 24:24 26:5,9 29:24	naphthalene 12:23
ingestion 13:11	Joliet 9:10	meet 17:24 21:4, 19 22:16 23:6,7,12	NAPL 12:15
inhalation 13:13	June 4:7,12	meeting 24:12 25:21 27:19 41:24 42:2,4,16	Naren 25:3
initial 37:2,12	K	meetings 37:24	nearby 37:23
injecting 7:10	kind 12:21 15:21		needed 25:20
injection 8:3			negotiate 25:2

negotiated 25:6 26:14	order 12:1 21:4,5, 19,20	permanent 24:2	practicable 17:20 18:20	proposes 23:14
negotiating 26:11	organic 12:19	Pershing 9:9	preferred 5:2 6:16,21,22 7:2 13:24 20:12 23:14 24:9 28:18 38:15, 16	proposing 7:20 23:18 24:10 38:12
network 14:20	organizations 31:11	person 36:23 39:3	Peter 6:4	protecting 21:6, 17
nice 6:7 17:1 40:18	oversee 4:21	phase 5:5 29:15	phased 29:4	Protection 3:5
nine-criteria 20:23	overview 8:23	physically- enhanced 7:4 20:12	preferring 7:2	provide 5:16
non-aqueous 5:5	Owen 27:6,10,11 28:6,15 29:12,18 30:10,15 31:2,6,19 32:8,20 33:5,9,17, 20 34:1,7,10,15,20 35:2,8,17,20 36:4, 18 37:9,16 38:13, 16,22 39:2,19,23 40:2,9,12	pick 40:8	prepare 25:4	provided 30:22
non-engineering 19:20	owned 9:14 10:9 27:4	picked 38:9	preparing 24:14	public 22:9 24:12 31:14,15,20,24 41:16
North 3:9 4:21 6:24 10:9 26:12,24 27:5 34:21 35:9, 12,15,21 36:8 37:4		picture 8:15,22	prescribed 19:5	pull 28:3
note 4:8		pictures 16:21	presence 15:10	pump 7:12
noticed 36:19		piling 20:4	present 3:7,20 10:11	purpose 4:24
		place 19:19	presentation 3:14,16 4:15,24 5:1,15 6:17,20 18:24 26:16	purposes 8:21
		plan 3:8 5:20 13:23 19:12	presume 42:4	push 7:11,15 8:9
O	P	plant 3:9,10 4:22, 23 5:6,18 9:8,22 10:8,12,21 11:14 14:15 34:11,14,21 35:9,11,12,15,21 36:8,10	pretty 15:3	pushback 40:21
O-w-e-n 27:11	p.m. 42:17	points 18:12	previous 15:9 30:13	put 11:21 16:12 29:8
objective 18:17 23:12	paper 12:20	polyethylene 20:3	primarily 17:10	Q
occurred 10:15 11:13	parallel 8:4 29:13	polynuclear 12:22	primary 20:24	quality 17:15
off-site 7:17 32:22	parcels 9:17	point 28:7,17	principal 18:5,7	question 3:16 27:6,21 29:17 31:13,18 35:13,14 36:1,16 38:8 39:7, 12 40:14
on-site 7:14	parent 11:20	points 18:12	prior 7:14	questioning 40:16
ongoing 4:21 33:2	parking 32:22	polyethylene 20:3	probes 32:21	questions 26:17, 21 36:5 38:17 40:20
open 3:17 26:17	part 9:2,4 14:11 19:6 23:5 37:12 39:10	polynuclear 12:22	problem 28:11 33:14 35:8	quickly 15:8
operate 25:8 26:15 34:11	parties 24:15	Port 9:2,11 10:1 14:12 15:20 32:15	procedures 25:12	R
operated 10:12 34:21	party 25:7	portion 13:8	process 22:12	
operations 34:14, 18	past 30:6	pose 31:14,20	processes 29:14	
opportunity 5:17	Paul 6:6,7 37:1	position 29:8 35:14	produced 6:24	
opposed 18:9	PCBS 16:20	possibly 13:12 15:18 17:24	product 37:15	
option 19:16,21 38:9 40:4	people 31:4,22 40:19 42:5	poster 11:2	program 10:20 11:22 37:5	Railroad 9:10
options 23:21 39:13	performance 25:11,14,21,23	potential 13:9,16 32:2,13	project 3:13 4:20	rationale 23:18
oral 3:20	period 4:6 22:9	potentially 13:10	property 9:12,13	reached 11:23
orally 4:1	periodic 33:3	Power 31:9	propose 26:4	read 11:1 16:9 31:24 33:20
	permanence 21:23		proposed 3:7,15 5:17 13:23 20:1	ready 38:4

realized 30:23	remediation 38:9	ROD 26:8	6:24 10:10 26:12, 24 27:5 37:4	29:6
reason 5:14	remedies 40:8	room 39:6		south 3:10 4:22
reasonable 17:21	remedy 21:4 24:6 25:5,8,11,15 26:15	roots 27:13	short-term 21:24 23:9	5:6 10:5 35:11 36:10
reasons 24:8 27:24	28:12,16 29:9 30:24	Rosario 3:12 4:14, 16,19 27:1 28:5,9, 18 29:16,19 30:12, 19 31:17 32:1,10 33:1,6,10 34:12, 16,23 35:5,10,18, 24 36:7,12,15 38:10,15 41:23 42:7,10	show 28:4 42:6	speaking 13:7 31:9
receive 24:15	remember 35:2		Sierra 31:8	specific 5:21 19:14 32:11
received 12:8	removal 20:18		significant 10:22 11:10,11 23:19,23	specifically 5:22 13:22 24:21
receives 4:1	remove 37:7		simplified 16:5	specifics 11:17
recent 14:23	repeat 31:18 39:9	Ross 3:11 4:14,15, 19 26:19 37:5	simplify 17:6	spell 3:21 27:9
recently 6:23	repeating 5:19	roughly 34:18	simply 27:22	spend 40:2,7
recommend 42:12	report 12:9,10,11 13:9 16:9 18:18 20:1 23:4 32:12	rounds 12:6	sinkers 16:17	spent 40:5
record 3:22 14:3 24:7,16,19,22 29:1 41:3,5 42:14	reporter 3:19 41:4	runs 4:7	sir 41:3	stage 36:17
recoverable 18:19	repository 14:2 16:10		sit 31:3,23 37:19 40:17	stand 40:19
recovery 7:5,12, 16 8:4,10,12 20:11,13,14,19 23:22	represent 14:17	<hr/> S <hr/>	site 3:13,15 4:23 5:4,6,11,21 8:22 9:4,8 10:24 11:14 12:5,7,13 13:6 14:2,15 15:3,11 16:6 17:14 21:13 24:23 28:14 31:16, 19,22 33:4,12,18 36:8,9,11 37:8	standard 25:21
reduce 18:19	representation 15:6 16:5 17:2	sample 16:22		standards 21:11
reduction 21:23 23:20 24:2	represents 11:6	sampling 12:5,7 33:3,5,7,11		standpoint 13:16
refer 21:7	requirements 21:8,10	savvy 39:5		started 4:7 12:3 34:17 37:17
referred 18:5	resistance 20:20	scratch 30:9	site-wide 17:11	starting 30:9
refers 20:23	response 24:14	screening 15:13, 18	sites 9:16	state 3:21 6:2,6,19 10:14 21:10 27:8
regard 42:11	responsiveness 4:4	sediment 13:17	slide 15:9 16:13 27:23	State's 10:19 15:13
region 3:6 7:9 8:6, 7 14:12	restore 17:14,20	semiannual 33:8	slides 5:7 27:22	stated 18:18
regional 6:5	restoring 18:1	seminars 17:1	small 9:12	steel 20:4
regions 14:16	restricting 19:11	sense 9:15 10:7 11:3 14:6,21 15:21 16:13	soil 10:23 11:13 12:14 13:13 15:17 20:3 24:24 26:6 29:2,3 31:16,21 32:9 37:7	step 38:3
regulations 17:18 18:14	result 23:13	separating 8:18		steps 24:11 25:9, 12
reinjecting 7:14	retired 27:15	separation 20:17	solvents 16:19	Stop 29:6
relative 22:22	reviewed 30:20	series 7:8	sooner 41:13	street 9:20
relevant 21:8 40:13,14	RI 12:9	session 3:17	sort 8:19,22 10:7 14:5,8 15:5 16:5, 13 17:3,5 18:10,11 19:2 22:23 29:4	stretching 10:17
remaining 26:5	RI/FS 11:24	set 12:18,21 15:13		stringent 21:10
remedial 3:12 12:9 13:7 15:6 16:8 18:24 21:15 32:11	risk 12:13 13:7,8 17:14 32:2 33:16, 19 34:5 40:19	settlement 11:23 26:14	sounded 33:21	strip 9:13
	risks 13:5,10,17 25:1 32:13	sheet 4:9 20:4	source 5:3,22 12:15 17:10,16,23 18:3 28:13,20,23	study 7:6 13:20 14:24 18:18,22 19:2,22 22:3 23:1, 5 25:13 29:22 30:1,10,13
	road 9:9 28:24	ship 7:17		
		Shore 3:10 4:21		

stuff 12:21	things 21:12 33:20 36:14 38:7	understanding 32:14 33:2	whichever 25:5
successor 10:10	thought 28:15 39:6	understood 28:2	white 8:2
suggested 13:9 15:1 32:12	threat 18:6,7	<hr/> V <hr/>	William 41:7
suitable 24:6 28:12 29:9	threshold 21:3,18 22:16	V-e-r-e-n-a 27:11	Winthrop 27:12
summary 4:5	time 17:21 23:20 34:21 37:10,18 39:6 42:8	vacant 9:21,23	wood 12:20
summer 4:6	timeline 10:8 11:19 13:19 14:5	vapor 12:15 15:17 26:7 29:3 32:16	wording 18:21
sumps 8:14	today 39:6	vapors 13:14 31:15,21 32:8,19 33:14	work 4:21 11:11 12:2
Superfund 11:21 17:18 22:12	tomorrow 41:24 42:2	Verena 27:10	workers 32:4
support 6:15	tonight 3:7,11 4:1 27:20 31:10	versus 23:23	world 40:3,6
surface 13:18 16:2,4 20:8	top 37:7	vertical 19:23 24:4	wrong 30:20 36:22 38:5
surfactants 20:16	toxicity 21:24	view 9:20	<hr/> X <hr/>
system 8:17 32:17,18	track 9:11	volume 10:22 21:24 24:3	xylene 13:2
<hr/> T <hr/>	treat 7:13 18:8	voluntary 10:19 37:4	<hr/> Y <hr/>
table 4:10 11:9 15:15 16:2	treated 7:10	<hr/> W <hr/>	year 13:21 33:8
takes 38:2 41:1	treating 8:17	wait 41:20	years 7:20 10:12 23:22,23 27:15 30:6,16,18 34:19 37:17 39:18 41:11, 12
taking 8:12 25:22	treatment 7:18	walk 31:23	
talk 32:1 36:1	trichloroethylene 16:20	wall 11:16 20:5	
talked 29:22 31:15	turn 4:13 35:3	waste 18:6,7	
talking 29:10 34:14	two-step 22:11	water 11:9 13:18 15:15 16:2,16,17	
talks 13:23 28:9	type 12:16 21:14, 15	Waukegan 4:23 9:11,13 10:5 27:13,14,16,17	
tar 16:18	types 13:4 19:18, 24 20:1 22:7	Waukegan's 3:8	
teacher 27:14	<hr/> U <hr/>	ways 26:1	
team 6:2,3	U.S. 3:5,7,12,24 4:2	web 4:8,11	
technical 6:7,11 39:13	unacceptable 25:1	website 4:3	
technically 39:4	underneath 15:3	welcoming 40:18	
thermally- enhanced 20:19	understand 27:23 28:8,17 32:18 34:8 35:17 36:4 37:20 39:3	wells 7:8,12,13,16 8:1,3,4,5,6,10,12 14:18	
thickest 14:11,16		west 15:23	
thickness 14:9			
thing 6:14 26:7 29:15,19 40:7 41:1 42:11			